

Physical Validation

Integrated hydrological/ model validation

Beth Ebert, Chris Kidd, David Wolff

Quality control issues

Necessary for validation & applicable to both radar and gauge

- What are the errors associated with the validation products?
- How do you calculate them?
- What do they really mean?
- What errors do you include? (uncertanties vs errors? KK;KUK;UKK;UKUK...)
- Sourcing of data affects QC procedures (e.g. some national agencies QC the data, others don't)
- Instrument quality issues: expensive vs cheap (ARG vs bottles)
- Representativeness of validation data in certain regions (e.g. terrain)

Ongoing issues

- Target quality guidelines (e.g. # gauges, radar calibration...)
- Indicators of quality also needed (e.g. clutter, BB etc)
- Data set redundancy over sampling of gauges and radar
- Error models such as ensemble models (how practical are they?)
- OPERA addressing error issues in radar products
- Chandra working group on QC
- Guidelines needed for optimal networks: data density /temporal sampling issues, e.g.:
- Gauges: AWS usually 1min/10min/1 hour, but if TBR 1min/10min is meaningless due to quantisation at low rain rates.
- Radar data: not true integrated estimates since they are sums of instantaneous samples

Flexibility, accessibility & compatability

Toolkits

 Expansion of tools to read other non-supported data formats (other analysis tools?)

Statistical techniques

 Standardised statistical testing (e.g. expanded contingency table) – simple but meaningful